

Appl. No. 10/673,902  
Reply Filed: 14 May 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: 13 December 2006

### REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action of December 13, 2006, the Applicant submits this Reply. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration is requested.  
Claims 1-20 remain in this application, of which claims 1 and 10 are independent.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-18, of which claims 1 and 10 are independent, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,722 ("Piech"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to Piech, a Splinder 601 "is used to split the multimedia information into two different shots and can extend the media information into one shot or the other." Piech, col. 4, ll. 24-26. The parts of the Splinder "are 'hot spots' which can be dragged with a cursor control device such as a mouse." Piech, col. 4, ll. 40-44. A single Splinder is located on each of the media tracks. Piech, col. 4, ll. 18-21. The Splinder "mark[s] the boundary between shots." Col. 3, lines 56-57. The location of the Splinder "represents the border between two different shots." Col. 4, lines 21-22.

In contrast, in independent claim 1, "*each* clip object includes trim *handles*." In Piech, there is only one "Splinder" per track, whereas claim 1 recites that each clip object includes trim handles (plural). Claim 10 has been amended to include similar limitations.

Dependent claims 19 and 20 have been added to indicate that the trim handles are displayed on left and right ends of a displayed clip when a user selects a clip, as described on page 15, lines 24-26 of this application. These limitations further distinguish the claimed trim handles from the "Splinder" of Piech.

Because claim 1, and thus dependent claims 2-9, and claim 10, and thus dependent claims 11-18, differ from the structure described by Piech, at least for the reasons pointed out above, the rejection is traversed.

Appl. No. 10/673,902  
Reply Filed: 14 May 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: 13 December 2006


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this reply, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, please charge any fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0876.

Respectfully submitted,

Avid Technology, Inc.

By:   
Peter J. Gordon  
Registration No. 35,164  
Avid Technology, Inc.  
One Park West  
Tewksbury, MA 01876  
Tel.: (978) 640-6789